

Discussion of SBX5 1 Implementation

March 25, 2010

Introduction

SBX5 1 (Steinberg) contains various provisions intended to make California more competitive for federal Race to the Top education grant funding including requiring the Commission [in consultation with the Committee on Accreditation (COA)] to develop a process by June 1, 2010 that authorizes additional high quality alternative route educator preparation programs in the areas of science, mathematics and career technical education, provided by school districts, county offices of education, community-based organizations (CBO) and nongovernmental organizations (NGO). SBX5 1 is provided in Appendix A of this agenda item. This agenda item continues the discussion of an alternative to regional accreditation for those entities wanting to offer educator preparation in California in the areas of science, mathematics, and technical education.

Staff Recommendation

This is an information item.

Background

The Commission's accreditation system was designed to focus on those issues related to running effective and high quality educator preparation programs. The issues that are reviewed are detailed in both the Common and Program Standards. The accreditation system was built based upon the assumption that an approved entity, typically approved accrediting bodies, had examined the broader institution and determined that basic issues of capacity to offer educational services were in place. This precursor review and approval process allows the Commission to have reasonable assurance that students will receive the educational services promised by the institution. This precursor process then allows the Commission's accreditation system to focus more directly on the educational unit and all its credential processes.

At its January 2010 meeting the COA discussed the implications of a school district, county office of education, community-based or a nongovernmental organization sponsoring an educator preparation program. When a college or university elects to offer one or more educator preparation programs in California, the Education Code requires that the college or university be regionally accredited prior to taking action to approve the college or university as eligible to propose educator preparation programs. There are six regional accreditation bodies approved by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA).

"The Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities," a subgroup of the *Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC)*, is responsible for the evaluation of the quality and effectiveness of colleges and universities offering the baccalaureate degree and above in California, Hawaii, Guam and the Pacific Basin" (<http://www.wascsenior.org/>). School districts, county offices of education, community-based or nongovernmental organizations are not eligible for regional accreditation from the WASC Senior Commission.

At this time other sponsors, such as county offices, school districts or other entities, do not have a requirement equivalent to the IHE's regional accreditation requirement. If a county office or school district is approved by the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the entity is eligible to sponsor selected educator preparation programs. In addition to being regionally accredited for an IHE or being an approved county office, school district or other entity, the approved institution must submit a complete response to the Commission's Common Standards and the General Preconditions. When an institution has been approved as an eligible sponsor, the response to the appropriate Program Standards must be submitted and reviewed. Once the response to the Program Standards is deemed by the expert review panel to appropriately address all standards, the program is recommended to the COA for approval.

Part I: Developing an "Alternative" Process to Regional Accreditation

In order to first determine what might be needed in developing a process that could provide the Commission with the same basic assurances as regional accreditation, the Committee's subcommittee began by reviewing both WASC and NCATE standards to determine which aspects of these standards might be applicable to an alternative to regional accreditation.

1) Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC)

There are four WASC standards for Senior Colleges:

- I: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives
- II: Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions
- III: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability
- IV: Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement

Each of the four WASC standards has a number of elements and specific criteria for review have been identified by WASC (Appendix B). The COA convened a four member work group to study the topics that are reviewed through WASC's regional accreditation.

The work group met in February 2010. Using the WASC standards as a guide, the work group developed draft Organizational Requirements (pages 5-7 of this item) that could be used by the Commission to determine whether an organization has adequate fiscal and organizational structures to support the organization in offering educator preparation programs in California.

The work group identified some of the elements of the current WASC standards as not necessary for the Commission to review as part of an alternative process either because the concept is not critical to the effective operation of an educator preparation program, the concept is addressed adequately in another WASC element or because the concept is addressed in either the Commission's Common or Program standards. Provided below is a list of the WASC elements organized by those the work group proposes to include and omit from the draft Organizational Requirements:

WASC Criteria for Review	
Criteria <u>included</u> in the Proposed Organizational Requirements	Criteria <u>not included</u> in the Proposed Organizational Requirements
Standard I: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives	

WASC Criteria for Review	
Criteria <u>included</u> in the Proposed Organizational Requirements	Criteria <u>not included</u> in the Proposed Organizational Requirements
<p>1.1 Formally approved, appropriate statements of purpose; define values and character</p> <p>1.2 Clear objectives; indicators of achievement at institutional, program and course level; system to measure student achievement; public data on achievement.</p> <p>1.5 Diversity: policies, programs and practices</p> <p>1.6 Education as purpose; autonomy</p> <p>1.8 Operational integrity; sound business practices; timely and fair complaint handling; evaluation of performance.</p> <p>1.9 Honest, open communication with WASC; inform WASC of material matters; follow WASC policies</p>	<p>1.3 High performance, responsibility, accountability of leadership system</p> <p>1.4 Academic freedom</p> <p>1.7 Truthful representation to students/public; timely completion; fair and equitable policies</p>
Standard II: Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions	
<p>2.3 SLOs and expectations for student learning at all levels; reflected in policies, advising, information resources, etc.</p> <p>2.5 Students involved in learning and challenged; feedback provided</p> <p>2.8 Scholarship, creativity, curricular and instructional innovation valued and supported</p> <p>2.11 Co-curricular programs assessed</p> <p>2.12 Timely, useful information and advising</p>	<p>2.1 Programs appropriate in content, standards, level; sufficient qualified faculty</p> <p>2.2 Clearly defined degrees re admission and level of achievement for graduation -Undergraduate degree requirements -Graduate degree requirements</p> <p>2.4 Faculty responsibility for attainment of expectations for student learning</p> <p>2.6 Graduates achieve stated levels of attainment; SLOs embedded in faculty standards for assessing student work</p> <p>2.7 Systematic program review includes SLOs, retention/graduation, external evidence</p> <p>2.9 Linkage among scholarship, teaching, student learning and service</p> <p>2.10 Co-curricular programs assessed</p> <p>2.13 Appropriate student services</p>

WASC Criteria for Review	
Criteria <u>included</u> in the Proposed Organizational Requirements	Criteria <u>not included</u> in the Proposed Organizational Requirements
	2.14 Information to and treatment of transfer students (if applicable)
Standard III: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability	
3.2 Sufficient qualified and diverse faculty 3.3 Faculty policies, practices, and evaluation 3.4 Faculty and staff development 3.5 Financial stability, clean audits, sufficient resources; realistic plans if deficits; budgeting, enrollment and diversified revenue 3.8 Clear, consistent decision-making structures and processes; priority on academics 3.9 Independent governing board with proper oversight; CEO hiring and evaluation 3.10 Full-time CEO; CFO; sufficient administrators and staff	3.1 Sufficient qualified personnel for operations and academics 3.6 Sufficient information resources/library, aligned and adequate 3.7 Clear, consistent decision-making structures and processes; priority on academics 3.11 Effective academic leadership by faculty
Standard IV: Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement	
4.5 Institutional research capacity; used to assess effectiveness/student learning; review of IR 4.6 Leadership and faculty committed to improvement; faculty assesses teaching and learning; climate and co-curricular objectives assessed 4.8 Stakeholder involvement in assessment of effectiveness	4.1 Reflection/planning with constituents; strategic with priorities and future direction; aligned with purposes; plan monitored and revised 4.2 Planning informed by analyzed data and evidence of educational effectiveness 4.3 Quality assurance processes; assessment and tracking; comparative data; use of results to revise/improve 4.4 Institutional research capacity; used to assess effectiveness/student learning; review of IR 4.7 Inquiry into teaching learning leads to improvement in curricula, pedagogy and

WASC Criteria for Review	
Criteria <u>included</u> in the Proposed Organizational Requirements	Criteria <u>not included</u> in the Proposed Organizational Requirements
	evaluation

The Work Group not only discussed which of the Criteria for Review from the WASC standards would be most appropriate for an alternative process for California, but reworded the statements in the WASC Criteria to develop the proposed Organizational Requirements. Provided below are the proposed Organizational Requirements for the COA's discussion.

***Proposed Organizational Requirements to be
Eligible to offer California Educator Preparation Programs***

A: Articulating Organizational Goals and Addressing Educator Preparation Objectives

The organization defines its educator preparation purposes and establishes objectives. The organization functions with integrity and autonomy.

- A. 1. The organization's formally approved statements of purpose and operational practices are appropriate for an educator preparation organization of high quality in California
- A. 2. The organization's objectives are clearly recognized and consistent with stated purposes. The organization develops indicators for the achievement of its purposes and has a system of measuring student achievement, in terms of retention, completion, and student learning. Student achievement data are made public.
- A. 3. The organization demonstrates an appropriate response to the increasing diversity in society through its policies, practices and programs.
- A. 4. The organization has educator preparation as a primary purpose regardless of political, corporate, or religious affiliations.
- A. 5. The organization exhibits integrity in its operations, as demonstrated by the implementation of appropriate policies, sound business practices, timely and fair responses to complaints and grievances, and regular evaluation of its performance in these areas.
- A. 6. The organization is committed to honest and open communication with the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, to undertaking the accreditation review process with seriousness and candor, to informing the Commission promptly of any matter that could materially affect the accreditation status of the organization, and to abiding by Commission policies and procedures.

B: Commitment to Learning and Continuous Improvement to Achieve California Educator Preparation Objectives

The organization achieves its educator preparation objectives. The organization maintains a sustained, evidence-based, evaluation system to ensure that high quality educator preparation objectives are met.

- B. 1. The organization's student learning outcomes and expectations for student attainment are clearly stated and widely shared among stakeholders and at the course, program and organizational levels. The organization's staff takes collective responsibility for establishing, reviewing, fostering, and demonstrating the attainment of these expectations.
- B. 2. The organization's educator preparation programs actively involve prospective educators in learning, ensure they meet high expectations, and provide them with appropriate and ongoing feedback about their performance and how it can be improved.
- B. 3. The organization regularly identifies the characteristics of its candidates and assesses their preparation, needs, and experiences. The organization collects and analyzes prospective educator data, disaggregated by demographic categories and type of credential program. The data reflects a high level of achievement, satisfaction and positive climate.
- B. 4. The organization ensures that all candidates understand the requirements of their educator preparation programs and receive timely, useful, and accurate advisement.
- B. 5. The organization's planning processes identify and align program, personnel, fiscal, physical, and technological needs with the strategic objectives and priorities of the educator preparation program. Planning processes are informed by appropriately defined and analyzed quantitative and qualitative data from multiple sources.
- B. 6. Leadership and staff are committed to program improvement based on the results of evaluation and assessment data that is used throughout the organization.
- B. 7. Appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, and others defined by the organization, are regularly involved in the assessment of educational programs.

C: Developing, Sustaining and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Quality Educator Preparation

The organization sustains its operations and supports the achievement of its educator preparation objectives through its investment in human, physical, fiscal, and information resources. These key resources promote the achievement of quality educator preparation.

- C. 1. The organization demonstrates that it employs an adequate number of instructional staff with commitment to educator preparation of high quality. The staff is sufficient in number, professional qualifications, and diversity to achieve the organization's educator preparation objectives.
- C. 2. Staff recruitment and evaluation practices are aligned with educator preparation objectives. For instructional staff, evaluation involves consideration of evidence of teaching effectiveness, including candidate's evaluations of instruction.
- C. 3. The organization maintains appropriate and sufficiently supported staff development activities designed to improve teaching and learning, consistent with its educator preparation objectives.
- C. 4. The organization annually provides unqualified independent financial audits sufficient to ensure long-term viability. Resources are aligned with educator preparation objectives.

- C. 5. The organization's information technology resources are sufficiently coordinated and supported to fulfill its educator preparation purposes.
- C. 6. The organization has an independent governing board or similar authority that, consistent with its legal and fiduciary authority, exercises appropriate oversight over organizational integrity, policies, and ongoing operations, including hiring and evaluating the chief executive officer.
- C. 7. The chief executive officer of the educator preparation program shall possess a post baccalaureate degree or credential and experience in education. In addition, the institution has a sufficient number of other qualified administrators, including a chief financial officer, to provide effective educational leadership and management.

2) Institution Accredited by NCATE

NCATE has accredited colleges and universities that offer educator preparation since 1954. In recent years, NCATE has been examining how an entity that prepares educators but is not a regionally accredited college or university could demonstrate that it meets the NCATE Unit Standards and therefore be accredited by NCATE.

As with most accrediting organizations, NCATE has a number of Preconditions that an entity must meet prior to being advanced for candidacy for accreditation. NCATE's Precondition #8 states "The institution is accredited, without probation or an equivalent status, by the appropriate institutional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Department of Education."

Precondition #8 provides an alternative for entities that are not regionally accredited. The alternative is known as 8.1.b and is provided in Appendix C. An entity which has earned NCATE accreditation would have demonstrated the fiscal and organizational characteristics, as defined in Precondition #8. 1. b.

Staff suggests that the COA might wish to discuss whether accreditation by NCATE might be seen as an acceptable equivalent for the requirement of regional accreditation. Accreditation by NCATE would not be expected of entities which elect to offer educator preparation programs in California although staff has met with one out-of-state entity that is interested in offering teacher preparation in California. The entity is a candidate for NCATE accreditation and has a site visit scheduled for spring 2010. Accreditation by NCATE could be an option in addition to the review of proposed Organizational Requirements discussed above.

3) National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)

Another option exists in that COA could discuss which aspects of Precondition 8.1.b. could be considered for use in California's alternative to regional accreditation process. As is described above, NCATE has begun to work with entities that are alternative providers—organizations that are not regionally accredited colleges or universities. NCATE has developed its own alternate requirement (Precondition 8.1.b.) for sponsors which are not regionally accredited institutions of higher education. It is possible that there may be one or more entity which is not eligible for regional accreditation, which would like to offer educator preparation in California, but is not interested in pursuing NCATE accreditation.

Staff suggests that the COA discuss NCATE's Precondition 8.1.b (Appendix C) and identify if any of the aspects of NCATE's alternative to regional accreditation should be considered for use in California, either in addition or in lieu of the draft Organizational Requirements.

Part II: Implementing an "Alternative" Process to Regional Accreditation

Once the COA makes a recommendation to the Commission on the specific requirements an alternative sponsor must meet, the process through which the institution's proposal is evaluated must be developed. At this time, it seems that the prospective sponsor would submit documentation addressing the requirements adopted by the Commission. Once it is known that the documentation adequately addresses the adopted requirements, the COA could consider that an on-site review should take place. Appendix D is provided to assist the COA in its discussion of a possible on-site review. The WASC process includes two separate on-site reviews. Each has a slightly different focus. The first review is focused on the capacity of the entity and is in preparation of the entity offering an accreditation course of study. WASC's second review has a strong focus on the educational effectiveness of the entity and the expectations for student learning.

If the COA would discuss the following questions it would provide guidance to the staff in developing DRAFT procedures for the review:

- a) Who should review the initial documentation? Staff, members of the Board of Institutional Reviewers, a different group of educators, or individuals with specialized expertise, such as certified public accountants.
- b) If an on-site visit should take place, what should the focus be for the visit and who should visit the entity?
- c) Should the process for the alternative to Regional Accreditation be revisited each time the entity moves through the accreditation cycle?

Next Steps

An information agenda item describing the work to date on this topic will be presented to the Commission at its April 2010 meeting. The presentation will include an oral update on the COA's discussion at this meeting. Based on the discussion at both the COA and the Commission meeting, staff will prepare an action item for the COA's May 2010 meeting.

The May COA agenda item will be an action item with specific recommendations regarding an alternative to regional accreditation identified. Once the COA takes action at its May 2010 meeting to recommend an alternative process to regional accreditation, the recommendation will be forwarded to the Commission for consideration and possible adoption at its June 3, 2010 meeting.

Appendix A

SEC. 5. Section 44227.2 is added to the Education Code, to read:

44227.2. (a) The Legislature hereby establishes the Science, Technology, Engineering, Math, and Career Technical Education Educator Credentialing Program for purposes of providing alternative routes to credentialing, in accordance with the guidelines for the federal Race to the Top Fund, authorized under the federal American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-5), that do not compromise state standards.

(b) No later than June 1, 2010, the commission, in consultation with the Committee on Accreditation established pursuant to Section 44373, shall develop a process to authorize additional high-quality alternative route educator preparation programs provided by school districts, county offices of education, community-based organizations, and nongovernmental organizations. Organizations participating in this project may offer educator preparation programs for any science, mathematics, and career technical education credential type issued by the commission if the organization meets the requirements for being authorized pursuant to criteria established by the commission.

(c) The commission shall authorize community-based or nongovernmental organizations accredited by an accrediting organization that is recognized by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation and the United States Department of Education. The commission may also establish alternative criteria, if necessary, for project participants that are not eligible for accreditation by one of the accredited organizations.

(d) Participating organizations shall electronically submit credential applications to the commission.

(e) The commission may assess a fee on a community-based or nongovernmental organization that is seeking approval to participate in the program. For purposes of this section, an independent college or university in California is not a community-based or nongovernmental organization.

Appendix B

WASC

Standards at a Glance

The full WASC standards are available at

http://www.wascsenior.org/findit/files/forms/Handbook_of_Accreditation_2008_with_hyperlinks.pdf

Standard I: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives

Institutional Purposes

- 1.1 Formally approved, appropriate statements of purpose; define values and character
- 1.2 Clear objectives; indicators of achievement at institutional, program and course level; system to measure student achievement; public data on achievement.
- 1.3 High performance, responsibility, accountability of leadership system

Integrity

- 1.4 Academic freedom
- 1.5 Diversity: policies, programs and practices
- 1.6 Education as purpose; autonomy
- 1.7 Truthful representation to students/public; timely completion; fair and equitable policies
- 1.8 Operational integrity; sound business practices; timely and fair complaint handling; evaluation of performance.
- 1.9 Honest, open communication with WASC; inform WASC of material matters; follow WASC policies

Standard II: Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions

Teaching and Learning

- 2.1 Programs appropriate in content, standards, level; sufficient qualified faculty
- 2.2 Clearly defined degrees re admission and level of achievement for graduation
 - Undergraduate degree requirements
 - Graduate degree requirements
- 2.3 SLOs and expectations for student learning at all levels; reflected in policies, advising, information resources, etc.
- 2.4 Faculty responsibility for attainment of expectations for student learning
- 2.5 Students involved in learning and challenged; feedback provided
- 2.6 Graduates achieve stated levels of attainment; SLOs embedded in faculty standards for assessing student work
- 2.7 Systematic program review includes SLOs, retention/graduation, external evidence

Scholarship and Creative Activity

- 2.8 Scholarship, creativity, curricular and instructional innovation valued and supported
- 2.9 Linkage among scholarship, teaching, student learning and service

Support for Student Learning

- 2.10 Collection and analysis of disaggregated student data; achievement, satisfaction and climate tracked; student needs identified and supported
- 2.11 Co-curricular programs assessed
- 2.12 Timely, useful information and advising
- 2.13 Appropriate student services
- 2.14 Information to and treatment of transfer students (if applicable)

Standard III: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability

Faculty and Staff

- 3.1 Sufficient qualified personnel for operations and academics
- 3.2 Sufficient qualified and diverse faculty
- 3.3 Faculty policies, practices, and evaluation
- 3.4 Faculty and staff development

Fiscal, Physical, and Information Resources

- 3.5 Financial stability, clean audits, sufficient resources; realistic plans if deficits; budgeting, enrollment and diversified revenue
- 3.6 Sufficient information resources/library, aligned and adequate
- 3.7 Information technology coordinated and supported

Organizational Structures and Decision-Making Processes

- 3.8 Clear, consistent decision-making structures and processes; priority on academics
- 3.9 Independent governing board with proper oversight; CEO hiring and evaluation
- 3.10 Full-time CEO; CFO; sufficient administrators and staff
- 3.11 Effective academic leadership by faculty

Standard IV: Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement

Strategic Thinking and Planning

- 4.1 Reflection/planning with constituents; strategic with priorities and future direction; aligned with purposes; plan monitored and revised
- 4.2 Plans align academic, personnel, fiscal, physical, and technology
- 4.3 Planning informed by analyzed data and evidence of educational effectiveness

Commitment to Learning and Improvement

- 4.4 Quality assurance processes; assessment and tracking; comparative data; use of results to revise/improve
- 4.5 Institutional research capacity; used to assess effectiveness/student learning; review of IR
- 4.6 Leadership and faculty committed to improvement; faculty assesses teaching and learning; climate and co-curricular objectives assessed
- 4.7 Inquiry into teaching learning leads to improvement in curricula, pedagogy and evaluation
- 4.8 Stakeholder involvement in assessment of effectiveness

Appendix C

NCATE Precondition #8. The institution is accredited, without probation or an equivalent status, by the appropriate institutional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

8.1.a. Current accreditation letter and/or report that indicates institutional accreditation^[1] status.

OR

8.1.b. Providers ineligible for institutional accreditation must submit a clean audit, a business plan, and the answers to the following questions:

- a. What security measures are taken by the unit to ensure the security and integrity of student records?
- b. What documentation does the unit have to demonstrate that facilities are safe, secure, and healthy?
- c. What are the unit's policies that ensure the availability of information about governing board members, faculty, and administrators?
- d. What are the unit's policies related to requirements for degrees, certificates, and graduation; fees and other financial obligations of students; conflicts of interest; and non-discrimination and sexual harassment?
- e. Are the unit's support services sufficiently staffed by qualified personnel?
- f. What are the unit's policies related to faculty tenure, grievance, and discipline?
- g. What are the policies related to academic and intellectual freedoms?

Non-university providers must also submit:

1. Clean independent audits of a full set of financial statements of the legal entity offering educator preparation programs for the three years prior to submission of the "Intent to Seek NCATE Accreditation Form." The audits should meet the standards of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants or other appropriate accounting standards generally accepted in the U.S.
2. The legal entity's 990 Form (for non-profits) or corporate income tax returns (for for-profits) for the past year.
3. A business plan that focuses on the unit being accredited. The business plan should include:
 - o A business model that briefly describes the services to be delivered, the area to be served, the current and projected number of candidates, recruitment activities, a description of faculty, tuition costs, a budget narrative, etc.;
 - o The most current approved budget;
 - o Revenue and expense projections for the next two years, including funding streams, the length and percentage of funding from foundation grants, appropriated governmental funds, tuition, funds from elsewhere in the legal entity or its affiliates; costs of facility, payroll, maintenance, etc.;
 - o A one to two page narrative describing revenue and expenditure projections for the next 4 years;
 - o A one to two page narrative describing the relationship between the unit and the legal entity offering the educator preparation programs; and

- If tuition based, the tuition refund policy should the educator preparation programs be discontinued.
- 4. Annual tax statements. The Financial Review Committee will review these statements in the fall of each year and submit a report to the UAB detailing its findings.

Appendix D

WASC

Expectations for Two Reviews: Clarifying the Focus

Expectations for Two Reviews: Clarifying the Focus

The WASC Standards for Accreditation apply to both the Capacity and Preparatory and the Educational Effectiveness Reviews. At the same time, there are important distinctions in focus for each review, as highlighted in the first table. The second table focuses more specifically on expectations for student learning at the time of each review.

NOTE: This table is intended to be illustrative of the differences between the two reviews and does not cover all aspects of each Standard.

	Capacity and Preparatory Review	Educational Effectiveness Review
Primary Focus of Each Review:	<p>Capacity: Institutional purposes, integrity, stability, resources, structures, processes, and policies including capacity to assess student learning</p> <p>Preparatory: Focus on issues in preparation for a successful Educational Effectiveness Review</p>	<p>Student Learning: Evidence of educational achievement</p> <p>Institutional Learning: Evidence and actions for improving performance; results of review processes</p>
Standard 1: Defining Institutional Purpose and Ensuring Educational Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear sense of institutional purpose • Integrity and good business policies and practices • Institutional and program objectives • Public accountability and transparency • Diversity plans and policies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Achievement of, or tangible progress toward meeting, institutional goals • Multiple indicators of effectiveness • Evidence of integrity • Analysis of data on diversity; use of analysis for assessment and improvement
Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions	Infrastructure to support learning*: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stated learning outcomes • Defined levels of achievement • Program review process • Support for faculty scholarship • Support for academic and co-curricular learning 	Educational results*: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed program reviews • Assessment results at the course, program and institutional levels • Results of assessment of student services and support • Use of these results to plan for and make improvements
Standard 3: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Assure Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate resources including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> √ faculty and staff √ policies and practices re: faculty and staff √ financial sustainability √ library and information technology • Sound organizational structures and decision-making processes • Qualified and adequate administration, board and faculty governance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate alignment, commitment, and use of resources to support learning • Evidence-based decision making • Effective governance and decision making
Standard 4: Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning processes that involve constituents and are aligned with goals • Adequate institutional research • Quality improvement systems designed in alignment with mission • Wide use of evidence in planning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engagement of leadership at all levels in learning processes • Quality improvement system results • Evidence of a learning organization

*Please see page 2 for a more detailed statement of expectations about assessment of student learning for the two reviews.

Expectations about Student Learning

Institutions and teams should see evidence of the following, related to student learning, at the time of the designated review. Each cell below includes references to the related Criteria for Review (CFR). **Note:** Not all foci in the CPR have a direct parallel in the EER.

Capacity and Preparatory Review	Educational Effectiveness Review
Are student learning outcomes set and published at the program and course levels? (1.2, 2.3)	Are students learning what they are expected to learn? At expected levels? Are these results good enough? (2.6)
Have expectations for levels of student achievement been determined and published? (2.4)	How does the institution respond if assessment shows that not all students are achieving at expected levels? (4.1, 4.6)
Are student learning outcomes expressed in course syllabi? (2.4)	
Are student learning outcomes for programs mapped to courses (such as through curriculum maps)? (2.3)	
Have assessment plans been developed and implemented?* (4.1)	Is assessment being implemented as planned? Is it effective? How does the institution know? (4.1)
Is the program review process developed and systematically deployed? Does it include both assessment of student learning and evaluation of student success indicators? (2.7, 4.4)	Is program review conducted as planned? What has each program learned from the reviews? Are patterns evident when reviews are compared? Are reviews linked to the resource allocation process, to provide for needed improvements? (4.4, 4.6)
Are co-curricular programs regularly reviewed with reference to stated outcomes? (2.11, 4.6)	What are the findings from co-curricular assessment? To what extent do co-curricular programs support learning? How does the institution respond to gaps in alignment of curricular and co-curricular efforts? (4.6)
Does institutional research support assessment of student learning and student success? (2.10, 4.5)	What do data on retention/completion show overall, and for various student groups? How do results compare with peer or aspirant institutions? What is being done to address gaps that are discovered? (4.5)
Do faculty have resources and support to assess and improve student learning and success? (2.4, 4.6, 4.7)	How do the faculty demonstrate responsibility for assessment and improvement of learning? (4.6, 4.7)

*Assessment plans should be:

- Developed by faculty, who are engaged in their design and responsible for their implementation
- Include multiple tools for assessing student work
- Include both formative and summative strategies
- Use multiple assessment measures, beyond GPA
- Incorporate and weigh both direct and indirect measures

1/09